



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,071	03/26/2004	Simon Fenney	3700.P0373US	8073
23474	7590	05/19/2008	EXAMINER	
FLYNN THIEL BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C. 2026 RAMBLING ROAD KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1631			HAJNIK, DANIEL F	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2628			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
05/19/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/811,071

Examiner

DANIEL F. HAJNIK

Applicant(s)

FENNEY ET AL.

Art Unit

2628

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 30 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 30 April 2008. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5-12 and 14-20

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

/Ulka Chauhan/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant reworded portions of the method steps in claim 1 and reworded portions of the apparatus in claim 10. These amendments do not overcome the 35 USC 103 rejection of record, and require further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues Redshaw does not teach the claimed features in the method of claim 1 (middle of page 9 to the bottom of page 10 in filed response).

The examiner respectfully maintains that the rejections are proper because in Redshaw the objects and tiles are directly related to the claimed invention. In addition, Redshaw uses bounding boxes around objects themselves as claimed. Redshaw states, "A set of tiles can then be selected which define a bounding box for a particular object and, in order to render that particular object, only the tiles within that particular bounding box needs to be processed" (page 2, lines 17-21, emphasis added, also see figure 5). In respect to this passage, the system of Redshaw is placing emphasis on the processing of objects in the rendered scene but uses the tiles as a way for performing processing on these objects. However, even though tiles are used the system still uses bounding boxes and objects.

Redshaw considers culling an object if a bounding box misses all the sampling points by determining whether the triangles of the object are visible or not. Redshaw states (page 3, lines 26-27, "We have appreciated that any object can be modeled as a set of triangles") and states (page 5, lines 16-18, "after which further tests can be made on it to determine whether or not it is to be used to make a contribution to the image being processed"). Redshaw also checks for sampling points (pg. 13, lines 9-11, "In order to test whether a tile lies wholly on the outside of an edge, we need only test the point on that corner of the tile which is closest to the edge" where this point can be a sampling point). The claimed object list is shown in figure 5. In this case, an object will still be culled if all of the triangles of that object are determined to be not visible (such as in the case of small objects where there may be only one or two possible triangles for a given projection view).